Prepared for submission to JCAP

arXiv:1512.07288v3 [astro-ph.CO] 26 Jul 2016

Dark matter from gravitational particle production at reheating

Tommi Markkanen[a] **and Sami Nurmi**[b]

[a]Department of Physics, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK
[b]Department of Physics, University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland

E-mail: tommi.markkanen@kcl.ac.uk, sami.t.nurmi@jyu.fi

Abstract. We show that curvature induced particle production at reheating generates adiabatic dark matter if there are non-minimally coupled spectator scalars weakly coupled to visible matter. The observed dark matter abundance implies an upper bound on spectator masses m and non-minimal coupling values ξ. For example, assuming quadratic inflation, instant reheating and a single spectator scalar with only gravitational couplings, the observed dark matter abundance is obtained for $m \sim 0.1$ GeV and $\xi \sim 1$. Larger mass and coupling values of the spectator are excluded as they would lead to overproduction of dark matter.

Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 The setup 2

3 Curvature induced particle production at reheating 3

4 Dark matter abundance 4

5 Observational constraints 6

6 Conclusions 7

1 Introduction

Cosmological observations are consistent with inflation driven by a single scalar field [1, 2]. Extensions of the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics however generically contain several scalars. This suggests that there could be many dynamically irrelevant spectator scalars present during inflation. The Higgs field observed at the LHC is an example of such a spectator unless its high energy potential would significantly deviate from the SM prediction [3]. While the spectators have no impacts on inflationary dynamics, they may have significant observational ramifications ranging from dark matter to primordial perturbations [4–15].

For an interacting scalar field, a non-minimal coupling to spacetime curvature $\xi R\phi^2$ is always generated by the renormalization group flow in curved space. While the coupling is irrelevant in the weak gravitational fields of the current universe, it can play a crucial role at the very high energies of the early universe and especially during inflation. It has been proposed that the SM Higgs could act as the inflaton provided its curvature coupling is very large $\xi \gg 1$ [16]. The stability of the SM vacuum in the early universe also crucially depends on the non-minimal coupling [3, 17–28]. For the measured Higgs and top quark masses the SM vacuum is only metastable but with a lifetime significantly longer than the age of the universe [29, 30]. However, the Higgs fluctuations generated during inflation could easily have triggered a transition to the true vacuum. The fact that this did not happen requires either $\xi \gtrsim 0.1$ [25], a low inflationary scale $H \lesssim 10^{11}$ GeV or new physics beyond the Standard Model. In [27] it was further shown that the production of Higgs particles at reheating through the curvature induced time-dependent mass may also destabilise the vacuum for $\xi \gtrsim 1$.

In this work we show that non-minimally coupled spectator scalars with weak couplings to visible matter constitute a generic dark matter component. During reheating the inflaton oscillations cause the curvature scalar R to oscillate between positive and negative values. Negative values of R generate tachyonic mass terms $m_{\rm eff}^2 \sim \xi R$ for the non-minimally coupled scalars which leads to explosive particle production. The mechanism is generic for $\xi \gtrsim 1$ when the curvature term gives a large contribution to effective masses of the spectator fields. Dynamics of the instability is similar to the tachyonic preheating scenario [31–33]. A similar effect was also recently discussed in the context of SM vacuum stability [27].

If the spectators are weakly coupled to visible matter, the particles generated at reheating will not decay and therefore form a dark matter component. If there were no isocurvature perturbations, each Hubble patch undergoes exactly the same reheating dynamics with shifted time coordinates. The amount of spectator particles is the same in each patch and the dark matter generated through the curvature coupling is therefore adiabatic. In this sense the setup bears some similarity to the freeze-in scenario [34] which also leads to adiabatic dark matter although the dark matter particles were never thermalised with the visible matter.

In this work we focus on the simplest case with a single spectator scalar with the non-minimal coupling $\xi R\chi^2$ and no non-gravitational interactions. We consider the parameter regime $\xi \gtrsim 1$, where χ is effectively massive during inflation and will not form a primordial condensate [12, 14, 15, 35]. In this simple setup we show that the tachyonic production of χ particles could easily account for the observed dark matter abundance $\Omega_{\rm DM}h^2 \simeq 0.12$. For example, for chaotic inflation and instant reheating, the correct dark matter abundance is obtained for singlet mass $m \sim 0.1$ GeV provided that $\xi \sim 1$. Larger masses are excluded as they would lead to overproduction of dark matter. For larger values of ξ the mass bound gets even tighter. The quantitative constraints are alleviated if the inflationary scale is lower or the reheating is not instant but qualitatively the picture remains the same.

Our analysis is based on the approximation where the matter fields are quantized and the metric is viewed as classical. This is expected to be a valid approximation for energetically subdominant spectator fields when spacetime dynamics are dominated by the inflaton decoupled from spectators. This means that our calculation can be approached in the framework of quantum field theory on a curved background [36] (for a recent application, see [37]). In contrast to other recent studies dealing with a non-minimally coupled theory [38, 39], our calculation is done in the Jordan frame, in which our analysis is simpler as there the model can be solved non-perturbatively without any issues related to renormalization. Related work on inflation and reheating with non-minimally coupled scalar fields can be found in [40–43], and in particular the generation of isocurvature via non-minimal couplings is discussed in [42].

Our sign choices are (+,+,+) in the classification of [44].

2 The setup

To present the idea, we concentrate on the simplest possible case. We consider a non-minimally coupled scalar singlet χ with no non-gravitational interactions

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left(-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^\mu\chi\nabla_\mu\chi - \frac{1}{2}m^2\chi^2 - \frac{\xi}{2}\chi^2 R\right) . \tag{2.1}$$

Inclusion of self-interactions for χ would not affect our general conclusions. However, the assumption of very weak couplings to visible matter is crucial for the generated singlet particles to survive as stable dark matter.

During inflation the curvature scalar is given by $R = 12H^2$, where $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble rate. We concentrate on the parameter regime $\xi \gtrsim 1$, where the field χ is effectively massive during inflation $m_{\rm eff}^2 = m^2 + 12\xi H^2 \gtrsim H^2$ and does not get displaced from the vacuum.

We assume the inflationary dynamics can be parameterised by a single scalar field ϕ, the inflaton. The curvature perturbation ζ is then completely determined by the inflaton fluctuations and is conserved on superhorizon scales. After the end of inflation the inflaton

starts to oscillate and eventually decays into relativistic degrees of freedom heating up the universe. We assume that the inflaton potential during reheating can be modelled by the quadratic form

$$V(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} m_\phi^2 \phi^2 \ , \qquad \phi < \phi_{\rm osc} \ . \tag{2.2}$$

Here $\phi_{\rm osc}$ denotes the inflaton amplitude during the first oscillation. We further assume that the inflaton energy density dominates the universe such that the Hubble rate at the onset of oscillations reads

$$H_{\rm osc} = \frac{m_\phi \phi_{\rm osc}}{M_{\rm pl}\sqrt{6}} \ . \tag{2.3}$$

Note that apart from eq. (2.2) we do not specify the form of the inflaton potential. In particular, the potential may differ from the quadratic form in the inflationary regime $\phi > \phi_{\rm osc}$. Consequently, we treat the mass scale m_ϕ and the amplitude $\phi_{\rm osc}$ in Eq. (2.2) as free parameters. Their relation to the measured CMB perturbations is determined only after the complete inflaton potential is specified.

After the onset of inflaton oscillations the curvature scalar, given by the trace of Einstein equation $G_{\mu\nu} M_{\rm pl}^2 = T_{\mu\nu}$, reads

$$R = M_{\rm pl}^{-2} \left(4V(\phi) - \dot{\phi}^2 \right) \ . \tag{2.4}$$

Therefore, R becomes an oscillatory function which changes sign each time the inflaton field enters the regime $\dot{\phi}^2 > 4V(\phi)$. The average energy density of the oscillating inflaton corresponds to non-relativistic matter and consequently the average value of R is given by $\langle R \rangle = 3H^2 \propto a^{-3}$. As the inflaton eventually decays, the universe becomes radiation dominated and the scalar curvature vanishes $R = 0$ at the classical level.

3 Curvature induced particle production at reheating

The oscillatory curvature scalar induces a time-dependent mass term $m_{\rm eff}^2 = m^2 + \xi R$ for the singlet χ. We assume its bare mass m is small compared to the curvature induced part at the beginning of oscillations $m^2 \ll \xi H_{\rm osc}^2$. The square of the effective mass $m_{\rm eff}^2 \simeq \xi R$ then becomes negative around zero crossings of the oscillating inflaton when R is negative. This leads to tachyonic generation of χ particles [31].

The equation of motion for χ can be written in terms of the rescaled field $\tilde{\chi} = \chi/a$, and conformal time $ds^2 = a^2(-d\eta^2 + d\mathbf{x}^2)$ in Fourier space as

$$\tilde{\chi}_{\mathbf{k}}'' + \left[\mathbf{k}^2 + a^2 m^2 + a^2 \left(\xi - \frac{1}{6} \right) R \right] \tilde{\chi}_{\mathbf{k}} = 0 \ . \tag{3.1}$$

For $m^2 \ll \xi H_{\rm osc}^2$, the effective mass goes negative for $\dot{\phi}^2 > 4V(\phi)$ according to eq. (2.4). In this regime there are tachyonic modes for which

$$\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = \mathbf{k}^2 + a^2 m^2 + a^2 \left(\xi - \frac{1}{6} \right) R < 0 \, . \tag{3.2}$$

These modes are exponentially amplified $\chi_k \propto e^{|\omega_k|\eta}$ which may result in very efficient particle production, even after a single inflaton oscillation [27]. This is very similar to preheating from the tachyonic instability analysed in detail in [33]. The instability may last over

several inflaton oscillations but since $\langle R\rangle \propto a^{-3}$ the total yield of χ particles is dominated by the first few oscillation cycles. Here we use a conservative estimate for the number of χ particles and account only for their generation over the first inflaton oscillation. Including particle production from later times could only tighten the bounds we find below.

For $\xi \gtrsim 1$ the occupation number of χ particles on superhorizon scales, $k < a_{\rm osc}H_{\rm osc}$, generated through the tachyonic instability after the first inflaton oscillation is given by [27, 33]

$$n_{\mathbf{k}} \approx \exp\left\{\sqrt{\xi}\frac{2\phi_{\rm osc}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right\} , \tag{3.3}$$

where we have identified the amplitude of the first oscillation with $\phi_{\rm osc}$. Including only the contribution of superhorizon modes, the variance of χ particles after the first inflaton oscillation reads

$$\langle\chi^2\rangle_{\rm osc} \approx \int_0^{a_{\rm osc}H_{\rm osc}} \frac{d|\mathbf{k}|\,\mathbf{k}^2 n_{\mathbf{k}}}{2\pi^2 a_{\rm osc}^3\sqrt{\xi R_{\rm osc}}} \sim \left(\frac{H_{\rm osc}}{2\pi}\right)^2 \frac{2\exp\left\{\sqrt{\xi}\frac{2\phi_{\rm osc}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right\}}{3\sqrt{3\xi}} . \tag{3.4}$$

Note that the amplification of superhorizon modes is a consequence of the coherently oscillating inflaton background which is nearly the same in each causal patch, hence there is no violation of causality [45, 46]. From (3.4) we see that the spectrum of the generated χ particles scales as $P_\chi \propto k^3$ and peaks around the horizon scale.

We reiterate that generation of the large variance (3.4) for a non-minimally coupled scalar χ relies on two conditions. First, the bare mass of the χ particle must be small at the onset of inflaton oscillations, $m^2 \ll \xi H_{\rm osc}^2$, so that the tachyonic amplification may take place. Second, our analysis assumes the χ field is energetically subdominant during reheating $\rho_\chi \ll 3H^2M_{\rm pl}^2$. This latter condition could in principle be violated by the tachyonic production of χ particles. However, the ξ values for which this could happen are so large that they will always lead to overproduction of dark matter. Therefore, in the observationally viable regime the tachyonic generation of χ particles never violates the energy condition $\rho_\chi \ll 3H^2M_{\rm pl}^2$.

4 Dark matter abundance

As the χ field has no non-gravitational interactions the particles generated by the tachyonic instability are stable and constitute a dark matter component. The amount of particles generated in each Hubble patch is determined by the local value $\phi_{\rm osc}$ of the inflaton field at the onset of oscillations according to eq. (3.4). Assuming there were no isocurvature perturbations present at the end of inflation, $\phi_{\rm osc}$ has a uniform value and hence the number of χ particles generated in each patch is the same. Indeed, for adiabatic perturbations each Hubble patch undergoes exactly the same expansion history but with shifted time coordinates. Even though χ was never in thermal equilibrium with the visible matter the generated dark matter component is adiabatic.

Neglecting the production of χ particles after the first inflaton oscillation and accounting only for superhorizon modes we find from eqs. (3.3) and (3.4) a lower limit for their number density

$$n_\chi \simeq \left(\frac{a_{\rm osc}}{a}\right)^3 \frac{H_{\rm osc}^3}{6\pi^2}\exp\left\{\sqrt{\xi}\frac{2\phi_{\rm osc}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right\} . \tag{4.1}$$

The tachyonic instability follows from the dominance of the negative mass squared contribution in the dispersion relation (3.2). Consequently, the excited modes are non-relativistic at the time of their generation. Assuming they remain non-relativistic during the entire reheating stage[1], their energy density at the end of reheating $t_{\rm reh}$ is given by

$$\rho_\chi^{\rm reh} = m_{\rm eff}(t_{\rm reh}) n_\chi(t_{\rm reh}) \simeq \left(\frac{a_{\rm osc}}{a_{\rm reh}}\right)^{9/2} \frac{\sqrt{3\xi} H_{\rm osc}^4}{6\pi^2} \exp\left\{\sqrt{\xi}\frac{2\phi_{\rm osc}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right\} \ . \tag{4.2}$$

Here we have used that $m_{\rm eff} = \sqrt{3\xi} H_{\rm osc}(a_{\rm osc}/a)^{3/2}$ during the effectively matter dominated period of inflaton oscillations.

As the reheating is completed, the universe becomes radiation dominated and $R = 0$ (up to a small contribution from conformal anomaly neglected for this discussion). The curvature induced χ mass vanishes and the particles become non-relativistic. Their energy density then starts to scale as

$$\rho_\chi = \rho_\chi^{\rm reh}\left(\frac{a_{\rm reh}}{a}\right)^4 . \tag{4.3}$$

Eventually the kinetic energies redshift below the bare mass m and the particles again become non-relativistic. Let us estimate when this happens.

If there are only gravitational interactions between χ particles they will effectively not scatter off each other. The momentum space distribution (3.3) preserves its shape but may get shifted as the effective mass changes. We may thus rewrite the energy density (4.3) in the form

$$\rho_\chi = \frac{1}{a^4}\int_{\rm osc}^{k_{\rm max}} \frac{d|\mathbf{k}|\,\mathbf{k}^3 n_{\mathbf{k}}}{2\pi^2} = \frac{k_{\rm max}^4}{8\pi^2 a^4}\exp\left(\frac{2\sqrt{\xi}\phi_{\rm osc}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right) \ . \tag{4.4}$$

The maximum wavenumber $k_{\rm max}$ is determined by taking the limit $a = a_{\rm reh}$ and comparing the result to eq. (4.2)

$$k_{\rm max} \sim \xi^{1/8} a_{\rm osc} H_{\rm osc}\left(\frac{H_{\rm reh}}{H_{\rm osc}}\right)^{1/12} \ . \tag{4.5}$$

We may then estimate that after the end of reheating the χ particles remain relativistic until $a_{\rm nr} \sim k_{\rm max}/m$ after which their energy density scales as $\rho_\chi \propto a^{-3}$. Using eqs. (4.2), (4.3) and (4.5) we get for the energy density at late times $a > a_{\rm nr}$ the result

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_\chi &= \left(\frac{a_{\rm nr}}{a}\right)^3\left(\frac{a_{\rm reh}}{a_{\rm nr}}\right)^4\left(\frac{a_{\rm osc}}{a_{\rm reh}}\right)^{9/2}\frac{\sqrt{3\xi}H_{\rm osc}^4}{6\pi^2}\exp\left\{\sqrt{\xi}\frac{2\phi_{\rm osc}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right\} \\ &= \frac{\xi^{3/8}}{\sqrt{3}}\left(\frac{T}{T_{\rm reh}}\right)^3\left(\frac{H_{\rm osc}}{H_{\rm reh}}\right)^{3/4}\frac{mH_{\rm reh}^3}{2\pi^2}\exp\left\{\sqrt{\xi}\frac{2\phi_{\rm osc}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right\} \ , \qquad T < \frac{T_{\rm reh}m}{H_{\rm reh}\xi^{1/8}}\left(\frac{H_{\rm reh}}{H_{\rm osc}}\right)^{1/4} \ .\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

From the last condition we see that the χ particles become non-relativistic above the CMB temperature $T_{\rm CMB} \sim 0.3$ eV provided that $m \gtrsim \xi^{1/8}(T_{\rm reh}/M_{\rm pl})(H_{\rm osc}/H_{\rm reh})^{1/4}$ eV. For example, assuming $T_{\rm reh} \sim 10^{15}$ GeV the χ particles constitute a cold dark matter component at photon decoupling provided that $m \gtrsim 10^{-3}$ eV (assuming the reheating process was relatively fast $H_{\rm reh} \gtrsim 0.01 H_{\rm osc}$).

For adiabatic perturbations, $\phi_{\rm osc}, H_{\rm osc}$ and $T_{\rm reh}$ have the same values in each Hubble patch. From eq. (4.6) we then obtain $\delta\rho_\chi/\rho_\chi = 3\delta T/T$. Comparing this with perturbations

[1]The χ particles could become relativistic already before the end of reheating if $k/a \sim a_{\rm osc}H_{\rm osc}/a < m_{\rm eff}$ which implies $H_{\rm reh} \lesssim H_{\rm osc}(3\xi)^{-3/2}$. Here we do not consider this possibility.

of the radiation component $\delta\rho_\gamma/\rho_\gamma = 4\delta T/T$ we find

$$\frac{\delta\rho_\chi}{\rho_\chi} - \frac{3}{4}\frac{\delta\rho_\gamma}{\rho_\gamma} = 0\,, \tag{4.7}$$

showing that there are no iscurvature perturbations between the χ field and radiation. Therefore, the tachyonically produced χ particles indeed constitute an adiabatic dark matter component, provided there was no isocurvature perturbation present at the end of inflation.

Substituting the present photon temperature $T_0 = 2.725$ K in eq. (4.6) we find the dark matter abundance comprised by the non-relativistic χ particles today

$$\frac{\Omega_\chi h^2}{0.12} \simeq \xi^{3/8}\left(\frac{m}{10\text{GeV}}\right)\left(\frac{g_{*,\text{reh}}}{106.75}\right)^{3/2}\left(\frac{T_\text{reh}}{10^{15}\text{GeV}}\right)^3\left(\frac{H_\text{osc}}{H_\text{reh}}\right)^{3/4}\exp\left(\frac{2\sqrt{\xi}\phi_\text{osc}}{M_\text{pl}}\right)\,. \tag{4.8}$$

This is the main result of this work. Here $g_{*,\text{reh}}$ denotes the effective number of relativistic degrees of freedom at reheating, T_reh is the reheating temperature and H_osc and ϕ_osc denote the Hubble rate and inflaton amplitude at the end of inflation and onset of inflaton oscillations.

5 Observational constraints

For ΛCDM the best fit value of the dark matter abundance today is [2]

$$\Omega_\text{CDM}h^2 \simeq 0.12\,. \tag{5.1}$$

From eq. (4.8) we see that gravitationally generated χ particles may easily constitute a sizeable fraction of the observed dark matter. In fact, their energy density might even exceed the observed dark matter abundance which yields an upper limit for the allowed mass m and non-minimal coupling ξ.

As a concrete example, let us consider chaotic inflation with a quadratic potential $V(\phi) = (1/2)m_\phi^2\phi^2$ both during and after inflation. In this case the Hubble rate at the end of slow roll inflation and onset of inflaton oscillations is $H_\text{osc} \sim 10^{13}$ GeV. From eq. (3.2) we then see that tachyonic generation of χ particles occurs for masses $m \lesssim 10^{13}$GeV. The inflaton value at the peak of the first oscillation is $\phi_\text{osc} \sim 0.3M_\text{pl}$ [52]. Using these input values in (4.8) and assuming instant reheating temperature with $T_\text{reh} = [(g_{*,\text{reh}}\pi^2/30)^{-1}3H_\text{reh}^2M_\text{pl}^2]^{1/4}$ (with the effective number of degrees of freedom close to the SM value $g_{*,\text{reh}} = 106.75$) we obtain the results depicted in Fig. 1. Clearly, requiring that the energy density of χ particles does not exceed the observed dark matter abundance, $\Omega_\chi \leqslant \Omega_\text{DM}$, we find a relatively stringent constraint on the mass m and non-minimal coupling ξ. For $\xi \sim 1$ the χ mass must be in the range $m \lesssim 10^{-1}$ GeV and the bound gets exponentially tighter as ξ is increased. If reheating is not instant, the bounds get alleviated as seen in the left-hand-side of Fig. 1.

While the results shown in Fig. 1 hold for the specific example of quadratic inflation, the constraints remain qualitatively similar for more generic setups as well. In particular, our main result eq. (4.8) only assumes that the inflaton potential can be approximated by a quadratic form near its minimum during reheating. Apart from this constraint eq. (4.8) applies for any form of the inflaton potential. Changing the potential effectively amounts to changing the values of ϕ_osc, H_osc and H_reh. As can be seen in eq. (4.8), lowering the inflationary scale and reheating temperature both decrease the energy density of χ particles and therefore alleviate the constraints on m and ξ.



Figure 1. In the top we plot the allowed and excluded regions for the mass of the χ field as a function of the non-minimal coupling ξ for $H_{\rm osc} = H_{\rm reh} = 10^{13}$GeV. At the bottom we plot $\Omega_\chi/\Omega_{\rm CDM}$ today as a function of the non-minimal coupling varying the masses and the scale of reheating as $m = 10^{-5}$GeV, $m = 10^{-8}$GeV and $H_{\rm reh} = H_{\rm osc}$, $H_{\rm reh} = 10^{-2}H_{\rm osc}$, respectively. The red region is excluded by the dark matter abundance (5.1).

6 Conclusions

Non-minimal couplings of scalar fields to spacetime curvature can be of crucial importance in the very early universe. For interacting scalars, such couplings are inevitably generated at one loop level in curved space. In particular, the stability of the SM vacuum both during inflation and at reheating crucially depends on the Higgs non-minimal coupling.

In this work we have shown that curvature couplings may also play a key role in dark matter generation. We found that gravitational particle production of non-minimally coupled spectator scalars at reheating may constitute a significant dark matter component. For single field inflation, the produced dark matter is adiabatic even if the spectator fields never were in thermal equilibrium with visible matter.

The mechanism is based on the generic feature that the curvature scalar becomes negative around minima of the potential of the oscillating inflaton field. This generates tachyonic mass terms $m^2 \sim \xi R$ for non-minimally coupled spectator scalars and leads to explosive particle production. If the produced scalar particles are sufficiently decoupled from visible matter they constitute a dark matter component. Moreover, if perturbations at the time of reheating are adiabatic, the reheating physics and the number of gravitationally produced particles is the same in each horizon patch. Therefore, dark matter produced by the mechanism adiabatic.

We concentrated on the simplest possible setup with a single non-minimally coupled spectator scalar χ with no non-gravitational interactions. In this case we found that the gravitational particle production can easily match the observed abundance of dark matter and even exceed it. The observed abundance $\Omega_{\rm CDM}h^2 \simeq 0.12$ therefore implies an upper bound on the scalar mass m and the non-minimal coupling value ξ.

For example, assuming quadratic inflaton $m_\phi^2\phi^2$, with the Hubble scale at the onset of reheating given by $H_{\rm osc} \sim 10^{13}$ GeV, we find that masses in the range $m \gtrsim 0.1$ GeV are excluded by dark matter overproduction for $\xi \gtrsim 1$. It would be interesting to investigate structure formation constraints on this type of dark matter particles which, in the absence of

non-gravitational interactions, will retain the out of equilibrium distribution formed by the tachyonic generation process.

While we have considered the simplest case with only one spectator scalar, the results can be straightforwardly extended to more generic setups with several weakly interacting spectator scalars. Finally, we note that if there are non-adiabatic perturbations at the time of reheating the number of gravitationally produced particles will in general vary over different horizon patches. This would lead to generation of isocurvature dark matter which is heavily constrained by observations.

Acknowledgments

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 program (ERC Grant Agreement no.648680).

References

[1] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO].

[2] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].

[3] J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice and A. Riotto, JCAP **0805** (2008) 002 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2008/05/002 [arXiv:0710.2484 [hep-ph]].

[4] J. McDonald, Phys. Rev. D **50** (1994) 3637 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.50.3637 [hep-ph/0702143 [HEP-PH]].

[5] K. Enqvist and M. S. Sloth, Nucl. Phys. B **626** (2002) 395 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(02)00043-3 [hep-ph/0109214].

[6] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Lett. B **524** (2002) 5 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(01)01366-1 [hep-ph/0110002].

[7] T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **522** (2001) 215 [Phys. Lett. B **539** (2002) 303] doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(01)01295-3 [hep-ph/0110096].

[8] A. D. Linde and V. F. Mukhanov, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 535 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.56.R535 [astro-ph/9610219].

[9] S. Mollerach, Phys. Rev. D **42** (1990) 313. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.42.313.

[10] G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov and M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 023505 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.023505 [astro-ph/0303591].

[11] L. Kofman, astro-ph/0303614.

[12] K. Enqvist, T. Meriniemi and S. Nurmi, JCAP **1310** (2013) 057 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2013/10/057 [arXiv:1306.4511 [hep-ph]].

[13] K. Enqvist, S. Nurmi, T. Tenkanen and K. Tuominen, JCAP **1408** (2014) 035 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2014/08/035 [arXiv:1407.0659 [astro-ph.CO]].

[14] S. Nurmi, T. Tenkanen and K. Tuominen, JCAP **1511** (2015) 11, 001 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2015/11/001 [arXiv:1506.04048 [astro-ph.CO]].

[15] K. Enqvist, S. Nurmi, S. Rusak and D. Weir, arXiv:1506.06895 [astro-ph.CO].

[16] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **659** (2008) 703 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.11.072 [arXiv:0710.3755 [hep-th]].

[17] O. Lebedev, Eur. Phys. J. C **72** (2012) 2058 [arXiv:1203.0156 [hep-ph]].

[18] O. Lebedev and A. Westphal, Phys. Lett. B **719** (2013) 415 [arXiv:1210.6987 [hep-ph]].

[19] A. Kobakhidze and A. Spencer-Smith, Phys. Lett. B **722** (2013) 130 [arXiv:1301.2846 [hep-ph]].

[20] M. Fairbairn and R. Hogan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014) 201801 [arXiv:1403.6786 [hep-ph]].

[21] K. Enqvist, T. Meriniemi and S. Nurmi, JCAP **1407** (2014) 025 [arXiv:1404.3699 [hep-ph]].

[22] A. Hook, J. Kearney, B. Shakya and K. M. Zurek, JHEP **1501** (2015) 061 [arXiv:1404.5953 [hep-ph]].

[23] F. Bezrukov, J. Rubio and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) 8, 083512 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.083512 [arXiv:1412.3811 [hep-ph]].

[24] J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, E. Morgante, A. Riotto, L. Senatore, A. Strumia and N. Tetradis, JHEP **1509** (2015) 174 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2015)174 [arXiv:1505.04825 [hep-ph]].

[25] M. Herranen, T. Markkanen, S. Nurmi and A. Rajantie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113** (2014) 21, 211102 [arXiv:1407.3141 [hep-ph]].

[26] K. Kamada, Phys. Lett. B **742** (2015) 126 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.01.024 [arXiv:1409.5078 [hep-ph]].

[27] M. Herranen, T. Markkanen, S. Nurmi and A. Rajantie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115** (2015) 241301 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.241301 [arXiv:1506.04065 [hep-ph]].

[28] I. G. Moss, arXiv:1509.03554 [hep-th].

[29] G. Degrassi, S. Di Vita, J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, JHEP **1208** (2012) 098 [arXiv:1205.6497 [hep-ph]].

[30] D. Buttazzo, G. Degrassi, P. P. Giardino, G. F. Giudice, F. Sala, A. Salvio and A. Strumia. JHEP **1312** (2013) 089 [arXiv:1307.3536].

[31] B. A. Bassett and S. Liberati, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 021302 [Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 049902] [hep-ph/9709417].

[32] S. Tsujikawa, K. i. Maeda and T. Torii, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 063515 [hep-ph/9901306].

[33] J. F. Dufaux, G. N. Felder, L. Kofman, M. Peloso and D. Podolsky, JCAP **0607** (2006) 006 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2006/07/006 [hep-ph/0602144].

[34] L. J. Hall, K. Jedamzik, J. March-Russell and S. M. West, JHEP **1003** (2010) 080 doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2010)080 [arXiv:0911.1120 [hep-ph]].

[35] D. G. Figueroa, J. Garcia-Bellido and F. Torrenti, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) 8, 083511 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.083511 [arXiv:1504.04600 [astro-ph.CO]].

[36] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, "Quantum Fields in Curved Space," Cambridge University Press, 1982, p. 340.

[37] O. Czerwińska, Z. Lalak and L. Nakonieczny, JHEP **1511** (2015) 207 doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2015)207 [arXiv:1508.03297 [hep-th]].

[38] D. P. George, S. Mooij and M. Postma, arXiv:1508.04660 [hep-th].

[39] D. P. George, S. Mooij and M. Postma, JCAP **1402** (2014) 024 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2014/02/024 [arXiv:1310.2157 [hep-th]].

[40] Y. Watanabe and J. White, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) 023504 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.023504 [arXiv:1503.08430 [astro-ph.CO]].

[41] D. I. Kaiser and E. I. Sfakianakis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014) 1, 011302 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.011302 [arXiv:1304.0363 [astro-ph.CO]].

[42] K. Schutz, E. I. Sfakianakis and D. I. Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 6, 064044 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.064044 [arXiv:1310.8285 [astro-ph.CO]].

[43] M. P. DeCross, D. I. Kaiser, A. Prabhu, C. Prescod-Weinstein and E. I. Sfakianakis, arXiv:1510.08553 [astro-ph.CO].

[44] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, "Gravitation," San Francisco 1973, W. H. Freeman and Company, p. 1279.

[45] B. A. Bassett, F. Tamburini, D. I. Kaiser and R. Maartens, Nucl. Phys. B **561** (1999) 188 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00495-2 [hep-ph/9901319].

[46] F. Finelli and R. H. Brandenberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 1362 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.82.1362 [hep-ph/9809490].

[47] G. Efstathiou and J. R. Bond, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **218** (1986) 1, 103. doi:10.1093/mnras/218.1.103.

[48] H. Kodama and M. Sasaki, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **2** (1987) 491. doi:10.1142/S0217751X8700020X.

[49] M. Bucher, K. Moodley and N. Turok, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 083508 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.62.083508 [astro-ph/9904231].

[50] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman and R. H. Brandenberger, Phys. Rept. **215** (1992) 203. doi:10.1016/0370-1573(92)90044-Z

[51] D. Wands, N. Bartolo, S. Matarrese and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 043520 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.043520 [astro-ph/0205253].

[52] L. Kofman, A. D. Linde and A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 3258 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.56.3258 [hep-ph/9704452].